

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 4, 2002

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Vlad Voytilla called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Vlad Voytilla, Planning Commissioners Bob Barnard, Gary Bliss, Eric Johansen, Dan Maks, Shannon Pogue, and Scott Winter.

Planning Services Director Hal Bergsma, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer, Senior Planner Alan Whitworth, Assistant City Attorney Ted Naemura, Support Specialist 2 Monica Pitney, and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

Chairman Voytilla called the meeting to order and presented the format for the meeting.

VISITORS:

Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda issue or item. There were none.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

Staff indicated that there were no communications at this time.

NEW BUSINESS:

Chairman Voytilla briefly discussed the purpose of this multiple-phase Public Hearing, observing that testimony is intended to obtain public input with regard to the scenic tree project. He pointed out that staff is available to respond to questions or comments, emphasizing that both written and oral testimony are encouraged. Observing that several more Public Hearings would be scheduled, including work

1 sessions and open houses, he pointed out that staff would keep the
2 public informed with regard to these sessions. He opened the Public
3 Hearing and read the format for Public Hearings. There were no
4 disqualifications of the Planning Commission members. No one in the
5 audience challenged the right of any Commissioner to hear any of the
6 agenda items, to participate in the hearing or requested that the
7 hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex
8 parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the
9 hearings on the agenda. There was no response.

10
11 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

12
13 **A. CPA 2002-0007 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP**
14 **AMENDMENT**

15 **B. CPA 2002-0008 – COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TEXT**
16 **AMENDMENT**

17 This is a request for Planning Commission approval of a City-
18 Initiated amendment to sections of the Comprehensive Plan
19 relating to the identification and protection of natural, scenic and
20 historic resources. As a first step, the City's Significant Natural
21 Resources Map would be amended to show properties on which are
22 located trees, tree corridors and groves deemed to be scenically
23 significant. These properties will be selected from sites inventoried
24 by City staff based on criteria agreed to by the Planning Commis-
25 sion. Previous inventories adopted in 1984, 1991 and 1999 that
26 identified significant tree resources would be deleted, and four tree
27 categories, specifically Scenic Trees, Scenic Groves, Scenic
28 Neighborhood Groves, and Scenic Corridors, would be shown on the
29 map. Additionally, the Plan's text would be amended to add Scenic
30 Tree Project inventory information explaining the significance
31 determination.

32
33 Senior Planner Barbara Fryer presented the Staff Report and briefly
34 described the proposed map and text amendments to the Comprehen-
35 sive Plan, adding that this includes the entire Scenic Tree Project
36 document referenced as Exhibit No. 23. Observing that the proposal
37 provides for the deletion of the existing significant important and other
38 natural designation from the 1984 that had been adopted by the City
39 Council, the Significant Tree Inventory adopted by the Board of Design
40 Review in 1991, and the Significant Tree Inventory Annexed Areas
41 adopted in 1999 using the Wildlife Habitat Category of Goal 5, she
42 pointed out that this proposal also adds four new scenic resource cate-
43 gories, including the Neighborhood Grove, Grove, Corridor, and Indivi-
44 dual Tree categories to the existing Local Wetland Inventory Maps, in

1 order to combine and form one natural resource map. She mentioned
2 that the Scenic Tree Inventory and background documents (Exhibit
3 No. 23) would be added to Volume 3 of the Comprehensive Plan.

4
5 Observing that staff is utilizing Statewide Planning Goal 5, Ms. Fryer
6 explained that this is under the Oregon Administrative Rules, Section
7 660, Division 23, adding that a number of resources are listed in that
8 section of State law. She pointed out that this includes 13 categories,
9 including Wetlands, Riparian Corridors, Wildlife Habitat,
10 Groundwater Resources, Mineral and Aggregate Resources, Open
11 Space, Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers, Oregon Scenic Waterways,
12 Approved Oregon Recreation Trails, Natural Areas, Wilderness Areas,
13 Energy Resources, Historic Resources, and Scenic Views and Sites.
14 Scenic Views and Sites are defined as lands valued for their aesthetic
15 appearance. She explained the notification procedure, as well as the
16 Goal 5 Process.

17
18 Pointing out that the Goal 5 Rules establish a four-step process, Ms.
19 Fryer explained that these steps include Inventory, Determining
20 Significance of Inventoried Resources, Conducting an Economic, Social,
21 Environmental and Energy (ESEE) Consequences Analysis, and
22 Adopting a Program. Noting that this Scenic Tree Project includes the
23 Goal 5 Process, as well as Inventory and Significance, she emphasized
24 that this is the purpose of this particular Public Hearing. She stated
25 that the notice had been sent out to the affected property owners,
26 Neighborhood Association Committees (NACs), community participa-
27 tion organizations, and interested persons, pointing out that this notice
28 had explained the Goal 5 four-step process, as well as information with
29 regard to what she referred to as the North/South Hearing Format.

30
31 Ms. Fryer announced that the First Evidentiary Hearing with regard
32 to the North Half of the area would occur at this time and that the
33 First Evidentiary Hearing with regard to the South Half of the area is
34 scheduled for September 18, 2002. Observing that both hearings
35 would be continued to October 2, 2002, she explained that at that
36 point, the Planning Commission would make a recommendation or pre-
37 liminary decision with regard to those resources they consider signifi-
38 cant, at which time the issue would be continued to some unspecified
39 future date. She mentioned that new notification would be sent out to
40 those property owners who have significant resources located on their
41 property, as well as the NACs, community participation organizations,
42 and anyone who participated in the Public Hearings.

43
44 7:19 p.m. – Commissioner Barnard arrived.

1 Ms. Fryer pointed out that a Supplemental Staff Report would be
2 prepared and available, at cost, for public review, as well as on the
3 City's website. She mentioned that it is anticipated that the Public
4 Hearing would be scheduled in either November or December of 2002,
5 adding that a final order for the decision would be forwarded to the
6 City Council for consideration at that time. She described the maps
7 that are available for review, observing that the quality and quantity
8 of each resource had been determined by ratings compiled through
9 input from the Planning Commission.

10
11 Ms. Fryer mentioned that the resources are located within certain
12 boundaries both the City of Beaverton and its immediate
13 surroundings, specifically from Highway 26 south to SW Barrows
14 Road, SW Scholls Ferry Road, SW Hall Boulevard, and SW Taylor's
15 Ferry Road; and the Multnomah County line, west to SW 170th
16 Avenue, up to SW Tualatin Valley Highway, and out to SW 185th
17 Avenue at SW Tualatin Valley Highway. She observed that several
18 resources are located north of Highway 26 in areas that have been
19 annexed to the City of Beaverton, adding that while this inventory
20 would be in place for unincorporated properties within Washington
21 County, there would be no regulatory affect until annexation occurs.

22
23 Observing that the Scenic Tree Project consists of four categories, as
24 follows: 1) Neighborhood Groves, which are predominantly developed
25 areas, which includes eight characteristics, rated high, medium, or low,
26 with a point value of 3, 2, or 1, respectively; 2) Groves, which includes
27 12 characteristics, rated high, medium, or low, with a point value of 3,
28 2, or 1, respectively; 3) Corridors, which includes eight characteristics,
29 rated high, medium, or low, with a point value of 3, 2, or 1,
30 respectively; and 4) Individual Trees, which includes five
31 characteristics, rated high, medium, or low, with a point value of 3, 2,
32 or 1, respectively.

33
34 Ms. Fryer mentioned that the three characteristics that had been rated
35 highest (Health -- a score of four) for Neighborhood Groves had
36 included the following: 1) Health, with regard to invasive species; 2)
37 Health, with regard to stock (overstocked or under stocked); and 3)
38 Health, with regard to edge effects. She stated that Appearance had
39 been weighted with a score of three; Age had been weighted with a
40 score of two; and Context (number of trees and rarity) had been
41 weighted with a score of one.

42
43 Referring to Groves, Ms. Fryer mentioned that the three
44 characteristics that had been rated highest (Health -- a score of four)

1 for Neighborhood Groves had included the following: 1) Health, with
2 regard to invasive species; 2) Health, with regard to stock (overstocked
3 or under stocked); and 3) Health, with regard to edge effects. She
4 stated that Appearance had been weighted with a score of three; Age
5 had been weighted with a score of two; adding that the remaining
6 categories, with regard to Access, Context, Number of Trees,
7 Complexity, Diversity, Scale and Rarity were given a weight of one.

8
9 Ms. Fryer stated that Corridors were rated, as follows: 1) Appearance
10 was weighted four; 2) Age, Frame and Context were rated two; and 3)
11 Length, Uniformity of Size, Uniformity of Species, and Native were
12 given a weight of one.

13
14 Ms. Fryer noted that Individual Trees were rated as follows: 1)
15 Condition or Health was weighted four; 2) Appearance was rated three;
16 3) Age was rated two; and 4) Native or Rarity was weighted one.

17
18 Ms. Fryer discussed the requirements of State law with regard to
19 significance, observing that it is necessary to determine which
20 inventoried resources are significant, emphasizing that only those
21 significant resources actually move to the next steps within this
22 process. She pointed out that staff recommends resources scoring
23 above average using the weighted scores that had been discussed,
24 adding that those proposed as significant are illustrated on two
25 particular maps and that those that are not proposed as significant are
26 illustrated on two separate maps.

27
28 Ms. Fryer explained that the total points possible using the weighted
29 score for individual trees is 33, with a greater than average score of 30;
30 for groves, the total possible points is 72, with a greater than average
31 score of 62; the total points possible for groves is 42, with a greater
32 than average score is 34; and for neighborhood groves, the total
33 possible points is 60, with a greater than average score of 55.

34
35 Referring to the aggregate of resources, Ms. Fryer stated that out of
36 507 Individual Trees, 338 (67%) have been proposed for significance;
37 80 of 139 (56%) Groves have been proposed for significance; 27 of 45
38 (60%) Corridors have been proposed for significance, and 124 of 220
39 (56%) of neighborhood groves have been proposed for significance. She
40 provided examples of these resources proposed for significance, as
41 follows: 1) Individual Tree – the City Library Tree (Sycamore Tree at
42 SW 5th Street and SW Hall Boulevard; 2) Grove – Hyland Forest Park,
43 off of SW Murray Road and south of SW Hart Road; 3) Corridor –
44 large, significant Evergreen Trees on SW Millikan Way; and 4)

1 Neighborhood Grove – trees north of SW Center Street and south of
2 SW Walker Road.

3
4 Ms. Fryer described the next steps in the process, observing that only
5 those resources scoring significant would be included in an
6 Environmental, Social, Economic and Energy (ESEE) Consequences
7 Analysis, at which point staff would consider the option of fully
8 allowing a conflicting use, such as a back yard deck or a development,
9 limiting a conflicting use, or prohibiting a conflicting use.

10
11 Ms. Fryer explained that upon completion of the ESEE and program,
12 the proposal would meet the six Comprehensive Plan Amendment
13 criteria cited in the Staff Report, as follows:

- 14
15 • 1.3.1.1 The proposed amendment is consistent and
16 compatible with the Statewide Planning Goals, including:

17
18 Goal One: Citizen Involvement
19 Goal Two: Land Use Planning
20 Goal Five: Natural Resources, Scenic and
21 Historic Areas, and Open Spaces
22 Goal Eight: Recreational Needs
23

24 following the ESEE process, the following goals would be met:

25
26 Goal Nine Economic Development
27 Goal Ten Housing
28 Goal Eleven Public Facilities and Services
29 Goal Twelve Transportation
30 Goal Fourteen Urbanization
31

- 32 • 1.3.1.2 The proposed amendment is consistent and
33 compatible with Metro Regional Urban Growth Goals and
34 Objectives and the Metro Regional Framework Plan.

- 35
36 • 1.3.1.3 The proposed amendment is consistent and
37 compatible with the Comprehensive Plan and other applicable
38 local plans.

- 39
40 • 1.3.1.4 Potential effects of the proposed amendment have
41 been evaluated and will not be detrimental to quality of life,
42 including the economy, environment, public health, safety or
43 welfare.
44

- 1 • 1.3.1.5 The benefits of the proposed amendment will offset
2 potential adverse impacts on surrounding areas, public facilities
3 and services.
4
- 5 • 1.3.1.6 There is a demonstrated public need, which will be
6 satisfied by the amendment as compared with other properties
7 with the same designation as the proposed amendment.
8

9 Referring to Exhibit Nos. 4 and 6 within the Staff Report, Ms. Fryer
10 pointed out that there is confusion with regard to the inconsistent
11 understanding of an adoption of the City's Natural Resource Planning
12 designations, which is the primary motivating factor. She discussed
13 staff's proposal in 1999 to digitize the existing 1991 Inventory, at
14 which time it had been determined that due to these inconsistencies
15 and because the 1991 Inventory had not been adopted using Statewide
16 Planning Goal 5, the Planning Commission had recommended that
17 staff review the proposal again. Observing that staff had reviewed the
18 proposal and returned to the Planning Commission on several
19 occasions in an attempt to refine the proposal, she noted that staff feels
20 that at this point in time there is a demonstrated public need for a
21 change in the current natural resource planning with regard to tree
22 resources.
23

24 Ms. Fryer discussed Supplemental Staff Report No. 1, which had
25 addressed several issues, as follows: 1) Notice Error; 2) Clarification
26 Regarding Resources; 3) Known Tree Removal; 4) Data Correction; 5)
27 Letters Submitted to Date; and 6) Notice to Property Owners Without
28 Resources.
29

30 Ms. Fryer stated that the purpose of this hearing is to receive the Staff
31 Report and public testimony with regard to the north half of the study
32 area, at which time the public hearing would be continued until
33 September 18, 2002 to receive public testimony with regard to the
34 south half of the study area. She suggested that the hearing should
35 then be continued until October 2, 2002, at which time the Planning
36 Commission should consider both the Staff Report and testimony in
37 order to make preliminary findings with regard to the inventory and
38 significance and continue the hearing to a date uncertain. She
39 explained that at that time, staff would provide the ESEE Analysis
40 and the program, as well as providing new notification to those land
41 owners who could be affected by the proposal, those who testified, the
42 NACs, the CPOs, and any interested individuals who have requested
43 to be included on the mailing list. Concluding, she offered to respond
44 to questions.

1 Commissioner Maks referred to page 11 of the Staff Report, with
2 regard to the percentages of the groupings of trees scoring greater than
3 average, and requested clarification of whether this is the same as the
4 slide that had been presented.
5

6 Ms. Fryer advised Commissioner Maks that an additional column had
7 been included, observing that the previous slide and this slide make up
8 the exhibit on page 11, with the addition of percentage proposed as
9 significant. She explained that the objective at this time is to
10 determine whether the inventory is correct, with regard to location,
11 quantity and quality of the resources, and also to attempt to determine
12 whether the significance rating that has been applied is appropriate.
13

14 Chairman Voytilla reiterated that informational opportunities are
15 available to members of the public, and encouraged anyone interested
16 to go to the back of the room and question staff, adding that informa-
17 tional maps and materials are available upon request. Observing that
18 although it has been determined that the north half of the study area
19 should be reviewed tonight, conflicts in schedule could necessitate
20 testimony with regard to some of the properties in the south half of the
21 study area, emphasizing that any public who testifies should clarify
22 which area they are discussing. Noting that any member of the public
23 wishing to testify needs to complete and submit a yellow testimony
24 card, he pointed out that he had requested that Ms. Fryer provide a
25 brief recap of the Staff Report following public testimony.
26

27 **PUBLIC TESTIMONY:**

28

29 **WES YUEN** discussed Neighborhood Grove NG O602, which is located
30 in Section 6, and requested a definition of the term Neighborhood
31 Grove, observing that the document he had received at the Open House
32 had actually provided two different definitions.
33

34 Referring to page 3 of Exhibit 23, Ms. Fryer described Neighborhood
35 Groves as being differentiated from Groves in that they are located in
36 substantially developed areas, with little or no under story species.
37 They are clusters of trees that could be distinguished separately as
38 individual trees, but that is difficult due to the density of the resource.
39 They are found within developed residential, commercial and
40 industrial areas, and can be planted trees. They typically include
41 large to medium sized groupings of trees, identified as being of the
42 same or similar species, age or height, that enhance the beauty,
43 character or value of a particular neighborhood or business area. This

1 classification is often used for areas that have been set aside as tree
2 preservation plat tracts following development.

3
4 Mr. Yuen requested clarification of which specific trees within his
5 neighborhood are considered significant.

6
7 Ms. Fryer advised Mr. Yuen that the Ponderosa Pines in his
8 neighborhood are considered significant.

9
10 Mr. Yuen referred to the permitting procedure, observing that it is his
11 understanding that staff is considering a process similar to what
12 operations is doing with regard to pruning street trees, and questioned
13 whether the \$50 permit fee includes all trees within a permit or is on a
14 \$50 per tree basis.

15
16 Ms. Fryer stated that she believes that the permit fee would cover all
17 of the resources that are included in a single permit.

18
19 Mr. Yuen stated that he would like to make a clarification to the Staff
20 Report, observing that the chart appeared to indicate that his
21 Neighborhood Grove consists of Douglas Firs, True Cedars, Oregon
22 White Oaks, White Firs, Western Red Cedars and Willows. He
23 expressed his opinion that it is amazing that there are no Douglas Firs
24 in his neighborhood, adding that he was surprised that there was no
25 mention of the Ponderosa Pines. He mentioned that he would prefer
26 that his portion of this Neighborhood Grove not be included in the
27 Significant Resource Tree Inventory, adding that in many ways, the
28 notion of Neighborhood Grove is quite broad. Observing that he does
29 not feel that his neighborhood accurately represents the definition of a
30 Neighborhood Grove, he noted that the exception involves the
31 Ponderosa Pines, which are not illustrated on the Significant Tree
32 Resource Map. He pointed out the location of these Ponderosa Pines
33 on the map, observing that at one time, a roadway existed in the area
34 that he referred to as vacated SW Baseline Road. Noting that a single
35 file and in some instances parallel file group of immature Ponderosa
36 Pines had grown along this roadway at one time, he mentioned that
37 several of these trees were also located on two of the properties
38 abutting SW Baseline Road, emphasizing that this is the extent of the
39 Ponderosa Pines in that neighborhood.

40
41 Referring to the notion of Neighborhood Groves in general, Mr. Yuen
42 stated that the materials he had received at the Open House had
43 described Neighborhood Groves as *areas where remnant groves of*
44 *Douglas Fir, Ponderosa Pine, and Oregon White Oak occur, and could*

1 *also be areas where the landscape trees have grown to a large size, crea-*
2 *ting a sense of community for that area. Neighborhood Groves*
3 *acknowledge the great job that folks have done to preserve trees within*
4 *the study area while accommodating development.* Observing that this
5 concerns him a great deal, he pointed out that this description could
6 feasibly also include the plum tree that he planted in his front yard,
7 the cherry tree he planted in his back yard, and all of the other trees
8 that had been planted by his neighbors subsequent to the purchase of
9 their homes. Referring to the notion of placing an overlay on
10 neighborhoods, he expressed his opinion that it does not benefit the
11 homeowner or neighbor in any way to determine that the City of
12 Beaverton would regulate the trees that they had planted because they
13 had done such a good job. He emphasized that while one of the
14 functions of government is to designate, once designation has occurred,
15 it is time to regulate, adding that although the government does not
16 always regulate the potential always exists. Noting that the action of
17 placing a line on a map actually implies regulation, he pointed out that
18 citizens do not understand that at some point in time, following
19 designation, the hammer comes down to regulate these resources. He
20 discussed the potential of turning many citizens into lawbreakers,
21 adding that most individuals do not obtain a permit prior to pruning
22 their own tree. He emphasized that rather than providing property
23 owners with the incentive to preserve trees, this potential for
24 regulation actually has the opposite effect, adding that he has been
25 incensed with this situation created by the City of Beaverton.
26 Concluding, he offered to respond to questions.

27
28 Expressing his opinion that the idea of Neighborhood Grove is
29 important, Commissioner Maks pointed out that he agrees with some
30 of the ideas expressed by Mr. Yuen, adding that his plum tree is not
31 significant and needs to be pruned.

32
33 Mr. Yuen advised Commissioner Maks that the plum tree had been
34 recently pruned.

35
36 Commissioner Maks pointed out that to what degree a Neighborhood
37 Grove is regulated is a major issue.

38
39 Expressing his appreciation of Mr. Yuen's testimony, Chairman
40 Voytilla advised him that the Planning Commission is not discussing
41 regulation at this time, emphasizing that the current goal is to identify
42 these resources specifically for inventory purposes.

43

1 Commissioner Barnard requested clarification of the median score for
2 a Neighborhood Grove.

3
4 Ms. Fryer informed Commissioner Barnard that the median score for a
5 Neighborhood Grove is 55.

6
7 **BRAD FUDGE** pointed out that while his property is actually in the
8 southern portion of the study area, due to a scheduling conflict, he
9 would like to address his issues at this time. Observing that his issues
10 are basically generic, he is concerned with Grove G05-S01,
11 emphasizing that he is in support of trees and feels that they are all
12 significant. He explained that his conflict basically involves the ESEE
13 formulation, adding that if any portion of a property owner's trees are
14 designated as a significant resource, any restrictions upon their
15 property effectively takes this value from that property owner. He
16 explained that by prohibiting or limiting the use of this property, it
17 becomes necessary to consider some form of compensation,
18 emphasizing that this does not necessarily involve financial
19 compensation. He suggested the possibility of transferring
20 development rights for density, or allowing revisions to height
21 restrictions, adding that this would compensate these property owners
22 from losing value by preventing them from losing value. He expressed
23 concern with the mandatory clearing of trees, versus the discretionary
24 clearing of trees within a development.

25
26 Expressing his appreciation of Mr. Fudge's testimony, Commissioner
27 Maks observed that he agrees with his suggestion with regard to the
28 necessity of initiating a density transfer process without requiring a
29 Conditional Use Permit for a Planned Unit Development.

30
31 Observing that he lives outside of the City limits, **EDWARD RITZ,**
32 **JR.** concurred with the majority of the previous statements by both
33 Mr. Yuen and Mr. Fudge. He discussed the general area near the
34 intersection of SW Cedar Hills Boulevard and SW Walker Road, which
35 he referred to as basically the old Cedar Hills neighborhood, adding
36 that his property is on SW Wynwood Avenue, which is a cul-de-sac that
37 stops just short of SW Walker Road. He pointed out that next to his
38 property is two Oregon White Oaks, adding that another White Oak
39 exists in a Grove approximately 1,000 feet away. He expressed his
40 opinion that this stretches the concept of Grove quite a bit, he noted
41 that he would consider these to be Individual Trees, which makes a
42 great deal of difference, because these Individual Trees are located on
43 individual lots. He discussed issues with financial responsibility that
44 is associated with these trees, observing that some property owners are

1 unable to absorb the cost of having these trees pruned properly, adding
2 that many of these larger trees are not appropriate for the smaller lots
3 on which they are located. Concluding, he offered to respond to
4 questions.

5
6 Ms. Fryer identified the three trees on SW Wynwood Avenue that Mr.
7 Ritz had discussed.

8
9 **DEANNA MUELLER-CRISPIN** stated that while she lives outside
10 the City of Beaverton, Neighborhood Grove No. 14-04 is in her
11 neighborhood. She pointed out that she supports this action and
12 believes it is a great idea, adding that she is concerned with Issue No.
13 2 in Supplemental Staff Report No. 1. She stated that she does not
14 quite understand this issue, and questioned whether any other trees
15 such as the Douglas Fir would be include, adding that she does not
16 believe these are Ponderosa Pine.

17
18 Ms. Fryer advised Ms. Mueller-Crispin that these trees are not
19 Ponderosa Pine, noting that it appears that some of the information is
20 contradictory.

21
22 **BRYAN COLE** stated that he has some concerns with regard to NG
23 07-01 on SW 174th Avenue, which is located four blocks outside of the
24 City limits. Observing that he has issues with the previous handling
25 of a sewer improvement project in the area, emphasizing that the after
26 effects of installing a sewer had created a swale through his property.
27 He pointed out that approximately 800 wetland plants had been
28 planted in areas that had previously been completely undisturbed,
29 noting that this is private property. He expressed his objection to
30 creating requirements with regard to protecting trees that were not
31 there in the first place, emphasizing that the City of Beaverton should
32 not be evaluating property that is not within their jurisdiction. He
33 requested information with regard to determining whether his
34 property had been included in the inventories adopted in 1984, 1991
35 and 1999.

36
37 Ms. Fryer explained that none of the properties located outside the
38 current City limits have been included in any of the previous
39 inventories.

40
41 Chairman Voytilla questioned whether Washington County could have
42 taken any action with regard to inventorying any tree resources in this
43 area.
44

1 Ms. Fryer stated that Washington County might have some of this
2 information in their Community Plans, adding that this would
3 probably not include any great amount of detail.

4
5 Mr. Cole expressed concern with interference from the pro-
6 environmental groups, emphasizing that any issues with regard to
7 private property should be up to the individual property owners.

8
9 On question, no other members of the public indicated any desire to
10 testify at this time.

11
12 Ms. Fryer provided a brief overview of the Staff Report and the
13 purpose of this hearing, including determining whether the proposed
14 inventory is adequate with regard to location, quality and quantity of
15 the resource, adding that based upon testimony provided this evening,
16 she would review information with regard to Neighborhood Groves.

17
18 Commissioner Pogue **MOVED** and Commissioner Maks **SECONDED**
19 a motion to continue CPA 2002-0007 – Comprehensive Plan Map
20 Amendment and CPA 2002-0008 – Comprehensive Plan Text
21 Amendment (Significant Natural Resources/Scenic Tree Project
22 Inventory) to a date certain of September 18, 2002.

23
24 Ms. Fryer clarified that the southern portion of the study area would
25 be reviewed on September 18, 2002, at which time staff would
26 recommend a continuance to October 2, 2002.

27
28 Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

29
30 **MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:**

31
32 The meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.